

**Amendments to the Drawings**

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 1-2. These sheets, which include Figs. 1-2, replace the previously filed replacement sheets including Figs. 1-2. In Figure 1, previously omitted element 46, described on page 7 of the specification, has been added and the duplicate use of label 44 has been corrected. In Figure 2, previously omitted element labels 61 and 69 have been added.

Attachment:            Replacement Sheets 1-2  
                             Annotated Sheets Showing Changes

### **Remarks/Arguments**

#### **Specification Objections**

The Examiner has objected to the Specification because of issues with a series of figure references. Examiner's objections appear to be based on the original versions of the figures, prior to the filing of the "SUBMISSION OF REPLACEMENT DRAWINGS" on February 14, 2006. The replacement drawings from February 2006 are believed to address all but the last of the objections to the specification listed in the present Office Action.

To address the final objection to the specification, the specification has been amended to change references to "chip enable/disable line (350)" to "chip enable/disable line (360)". Further modifications to the drawings have been made in response to other objections. New replacement sheets are attached. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the objections have been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

#### **Claim Objections**

The Examiner has objected to claims 11-13 based upon incorrect dependencies and an improper figure reference.

The claims have been amended in accordance with Examiner's suggestions. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the objections have been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

**35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1-3, 7-10, and 13-19, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Miyazaki (U.S. Patent No. 5,883,676).

It is respectfully asserted that Miyazaki fails to disclose: “writing video filter coefficient data corresponding to a second bank of video filter coefficients to a second memory in response to said change in said video display format,” as described in currently amended claim 1.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that a change in video format is detected and a second bank of coefficient data is written in response. At a vertical blanking interval, an output is switched from a first memory with first coefficients to a second memory with second coefficients. Switching coefficients during the blanking interval to the set corresponding to the newly detected video format causes the use of coefficients appropriate for that new video format without producing undesirable disturbances in the picture. (Specification, page 2)

It is submitted that the system of Miyazaki neither discloses nor suggests writing video filter coefficient data to a second bank of coefficients in response to a change in video display format, as described in the present claims. In contrast, the goal of Miyazaki is to “provide a video signal outputting apparatus capable of displaying fine images on a monitor with decreasing the number of VRAMs.” (Miyazaki, column 2, lines 10-14) Miyazaki mentions “blanking interval” only once in the context of detecting a horizontal synchronization signal. Miyazaki does not describe or suggest triggering a change of coefficients based upon the blanking interval.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Miyazaki fails to disclose: “writing video filter coefficient data corresponding to a second bank of video filter coefficients to a second memory in response to said change in said video display format,” as described in currently amended claim 1.

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims, it is respectfully asserted that there is no 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure provided by Miyazaki that makes

the present invention as claimed in claim 1 unpatentable. It is further submitted that independent claims 8 and 13 are allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Since dependent claims 2-7, 9-12, and 14-19 are dependent from their respective independent claims, it is submitted that they too are allowable for at least the same reasons that their respective independent claims are allowable. Thus, it is further respectfully submitted that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-6, and 13-19, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Yeh (U.S. Patent No. 6,411,334).

It is respectfully asserted that Yeh fails to disclose: "writing video filter coefficient data corresponding to a second bank of video filter coefficients to a second memory in response to said change in said video display format," as described in currently amended claim 1.

As described above, Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that a change in video format is detected and a second bank of coefficient data is written in response. At a vertical blanking interval, an output is switched from a first memory with first coefficients to a second memory with second coefficients. Switching coefficients during the blanking interval to the set corresponding to the newly detected video format provides a change to processing appropriate for that video format without producing undesirable disturbances in the picture. (Specification, page 2)

It is submitted that the system of Yeh neither discloses nor suggests writing video filter coefficient data to a second bank of coefficients in response to a change in video display format, as described in the present claims. In contrast, the goal of Yeh is correcting the display aspect ratio and performing antiflickering on video data. (Yeh, column 2, lines 34-36) Yeh does not discuss "blanking intervals," nor does it describe or suggest triggering a change of coefficients based upon the blanking interval.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Yeh also fails to disclose: "writing video filter coefficient data corresponding to a second bank of video filter coefficients to a second

memory in response to said change in said video display format," as described in currently amended claim 1.

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims, it is respectfully asserted that there is no 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure provided by Yeh that makes the present invention as claimed in claim 1 unpatentable. It is further submitted that independent claim 13 is allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Since dependent claims 2-6 and 14-19 are dependent from allowable independent claims 1 and 13, respectively, it is submitted that they too are allowable for at least the same reasons that their respective independent claims are allowable. Thus, it is further respectfully submitted that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's representative at (609) 734-6804, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Brian J Cromarty  
Reg. No. L0027  
Phone (609) 734-6804

Patent Operations  
Thomson Licensing Inc.  
P.O. Box 5312  
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312  
November 14, 2008

Ser. No. 10/519,028  
Amdt. dated September 15, 2008  
Reply to Office action of June 30, 2008  
Internal Docket No. PU020313

REPLACEMENT SHEET

[INSERT REPLACEMENT DRAWING SHEETS FOR FIGS 1-2]